

NOTICE: This opinion is subject to formal revision before publication in the bound volumes of NLRB decisions. Readers are requested to notify the Executive Secretary, National Labor Relations Board, Washington, D.C. 20570, of any typographical or other formal errors so that corrections can be included in the bound volumes.

Hubert Distributors, Inc. and Local 1038, International Brotherhood of Teamsters, AFL-CIO.
Case 7-CA-31719(6)

March 7, 2005

SUPPLEMENTAL DECISION AND ORDER

BY CHAIRMAN BATTISTA AND MEMBERS LIEBMAN
AND SCHAUMBER

On December 16, 2003, Administrative Law Judge Ira Sandron issued the attached supplemental decision. The Respondent filed exceptions and a supporting brief. The General Counsel and the Charging Party each filed an answering brief.

The National Labor Relations Board has considered the supplemental decision and the record in light of the exceptions¹ and briefs² and has decided to affirm the judge's rulings, findings,³ and conclusions and to adopt the recommended Order as clarified below.

In the recommended Order, the judge directed the Respondent to "pay the individuals named in the Appendix the indicated amounts of total gross backpay and other reimbursable sums for the period from April 15, 1991 to June 30, 1998, with interest." As discussed in the judge's decision, in November 2000, the Respondent made a "voluntary payment" directly to certain warehouse employees in the amount of \$423,922.28, as an offset to accrued backpay. Taking this interim payment into consideration when preparing the compliance specification, the Regional Director apportioned the payment, in the judge's words, "into principal and interest that would have been due at the time the payment was made." The Regional Director then estimated the portion of the interim payment attributable to interest by applying to each quarterly backpay amount the interest rate from the fourth quarter of 1994, the "median quarter" between the second quarter of 1991 and the second quarter of 1998

¹ No exceptions were filed to the judge's findings and conclusions concerning medical costs and worker's compensation offsets. We adopt those findings and conclusions.

² The Respondent has requested oral argument. The request is denied as the record, exceptions, and briefs adequately present the issues and the positions of the parties.

³ The Respondent has excepted to some of the judge's credibility findings. The Board's established policy is not to overrule an administrative law judge's credibility resolutions unless the clear preponderance of all the relevant evidence convinces us that they are incorrect. *Standard Dry Wall Products*, 91 NLRB 544 (1950), *enfd.* 188 F.2d 362 (3d Cir. 1951). We have carefully examined the record and find no basis for reversing the findings.

(the backpay period). The judge accepted those determinations.

The Respondent has excepted to both of them. First, the Respondent contends that the entire amount of its interim payment should be treated as principal. Second, the Respondent contends that, even assuming the payment should be apportioned between principal and interest, the "median quarter" methodology is inconsistent with our case law.

We find no merit in the Respondent's contention that it was error for the judge to allocate any portion of the interim payment towards interest. Interest began accruing when the Respondent committed the unfair labor practices and incurred liability for backpay. Applying the entire interim payment to principal, as the Respondent would have us do, would ignore the fact that interest had already accrued during the 9-year period before that payment was made. The discriminatees are entitled to that interest. The judge therefore correctly determined that it was appropriate to treat the payment as part principal and part interest.

As stated above, the Respondent further contends that, even assuming that it is appropriate to allocate its interim payment between principal and interest, the judge erred because the compliance specification, accepted by the judge, calculated interest on the "interim payment" on the basis of a "median quarter," rather than using the Board's quarter-by-quarter basis. But the judge's decision, properly understood, still allows for interest to be calculated, on the whole, on a quarter-by-quarter basis.

Indeed, at the hearing, Field Examiner Mark Baines, who prepared the compliance specification, testified that his apportionment of the voluntary payment between principal and interest, based on a median calendar quarter, was provisional, i.e., subject to a final calculation after the Board issues its decision:

Q: In terms of the interest factors, *the interest amount was included, subject to final calculation when this matter is concluded based on the regulations.* Correct?

A. (Baines) Yes.

Q. *Actually, computing, quarterly.*

A. (Baines) Yes.

Q. So, what you have done is, you have fixed an amount, at this point, using a methodology that you are comfortable with, *to arrive at an estimate.*

A. (Baines) A reasonable one. Yes. Yes.

Q. *Not suggesting that, that is going to be the number that anybody was bound by, at that point.*

A. (Baines) That is true.

Q. In terms of the interest.

A. (Baines) That is true. It is just that—had to come up with something.

[Transcript 679–680, emphasis added.]

Accordingly, and as the judge implicitly found by accepting the Regional Director's determinations, the use of the "median quarter" for allocating the Respondent's payment between principal and interest was solely for the purpose of developing the estimate set forth in the compliance specification. The Regional Director assumed that there would be a need to perform a final, quarter-by-quarter calculation of interest following the issuance of this decision.

To the extent that the judge's recommended order is unclear regarding this point, we clarify that the Order imposes a requirement on the Regional Director to calculate the final amounts of backpay, other reimbursable amounts, and interest due the employees listed in the compliance specification, including the interest portion of the Respondent's voluntary payment, on a quarter-by-quarter basis, as required by our case law. We recognize that this final calculation is likely to alter the backpay amounts listed in the Appendix to the judge's decision. Therefore, in adopting the judge's decision and recommended Order, we do so subject to any alterations in backpay amounts attributable to the final calculation.

In all other respects, we adopt the judge's findings and conclusions.

ORDER

The National Labor Relations Board adopts the recommended Order of the administrative law judge and orders that the Respondent, Hubert Distributors, Inc., Detroit, Michigan, its officers, agents, successors, and assigns, shall pay the individuals named in the Appendix the backpay and other reimbursable sums as shown in the Appendix, subject to the final, quarter-by-quarter calculation of interest, including the portion of the Respondent's voluntary payment attributable to interest, as provided in the Casehandling Manual (Part Three) Compliance, for the period from April 15, 1991 to June 30, 1998, with interest as prescribed in *New Horizons for the Retarded*, 283 NLRB 1173 (1987), accrued to the date of payment and minus tax withholding required by law. Dated, Washington, D.C. March 7, 2005

Robert J. Battista, Chairman

Wilma B. Liebman, Member

Peter C. Schaumber, Member

(SEAL) NATIONAL LABOR RELATIONS BOARD

Richard F. Czubaj, Esq., for the General Counsel.

J. Laevin Weiner, Esq. (Frank, Haron, Weiner and Navarro), of Troy, Michigan, for the Respondent.

Judith A. Sale, Esq. (Klimist, McKnight, Sale, McClow & Canzano, P.C.), of Southfield, Michigan, for the Charging Party.

SUPPLEMENTAL DECISION AND ORDER

STATEMENT OF THE CASE

IRA SANDRON, Administrative Law Judge. This matter arises out of a compliance specification and notice of hearing issued on March 4, 2003,¹ against Hubert Distributors, Inc. (the Respondent), and a superseding compliance specification (the final specification) filed by the General Counsel at the conclusion of proceedings.²

Pursuant to notice, I conducted a trial in Detroit, Michigan, on June 17 to 20, and July 22 and 23, at which all parties were afforded full opportunity to be heard, to examine and cross-examine witnesses, and to introduce evidence.

The General Counsel called Field Examiner Mark Baines, who had the most direct involvement in the preparation of the original backpay specification; and Greg Nowak, the Union's president. The General Counsel and the Union jointly called drivers David Dennis, Tom O'Dwyer, and Jim Radulski. The Respondent called Peter Ferguson, its chief financial officer; employee Mike Lozano; and Mike Mrozinski, its delivery manager. All parties filed helpful posthearing briefs, which I have duly considered.

These proceedings stem from a November 8, 1996, Decision and Order of the Board in *Don Lee Distributor, Inc.*, 322 NLRB 470 (1996), *enfd.* 145 F.3d 834 (6th Cir. 1998) (the Order).³ As detailed therein, the Respondent was a member of a multiemployer association, the Downriver, Detroit, Oakland, Macomb Wholesalers Association, Inc. (DDOM), comprised of beer distributors in the greater Detroit, Michigan metropolitan area. DDOM and the Union were parties to a collective-bargaining agreement, effective from August 17, 1987 to May 1, 1990.⁴ The Respondent, along with five other employer-members of DDOM, resigned from the association and entered into a secret pact concerning how each of them would negotiate new, and ostensibly individual, contracts with the Union. On February 7, 1991, these employers, including the Respondent, unilaterally implemented offers they had made to the Union that reflected their secret pact (the implementation).

The Board ordered the Respondent to rescind the entire February 7, 1991 implementation, including but not limited to the implementation of new classifications, and the elimination or reduction of hourly wage rates and holiday and vacation pay.

¹ All dates are in 2003 unless otherwise indicated.

² GC Exh. 20.

³ GC Exh. 1(a) & (b), respectively.

⁴ Jt. Exh. 1.

The Respondent was further ordered to make whole all unit employees⁵ for any loss of wages and benefits they suffered as a result of the unlawful changes. There is no dispute that the backpay period began on April 15, 1991 and ended on June 30, 1998.

Legal Parameters

Ordinarily, a statement of the applicable law logically follows findings of fact. However, here a determination of what facts are significant must be viewed in light of the governing legal standard for evaluating the General Counsel's calculations of backpay and other benefits.

The applicable legal precepts are well established. The objective in compliance proceedings is to restore, to the extent feasible, the status quo ante by restoring the circumstances that would have existed had there been no unfair labor practices. *Alaska Pulp Corp.*, 326 NLRB 522, 523 (1998), citing *Phelps-Dodge Corp. v. NLRB*, 313 NLRB 177, 194 (1941). In seeking to objectively reconstruct backpay amounts as accurately as possible, the General Counsel may properly adopt elements from the suggested formulas of the parties. *Performance Friction Corp.*, 335 NLRB 1117 (2001), citing *Hill Transportation Co.*, 102 NLRB 1015, 1020 (1953).

As the Board recognized in *Alaska Pulp Corp.*, supra at 523, "Determining what would have happened absent a respondent's unfair labor practices . . . is often problematic and inexact. Several equally valid theories may be available, each one yielding a somewhat different result. Accordingly, the General Counsel is allowed a wide discretion in picking a formula." See also, *Moran Printing*, 330 NLRB 376 at 376-377 (1999). The Region has the burden of establishing only that the gross backpay amounts contained in a backpay specification are a reasonable and not arbitrary approximation. *Virginia Electric Co. v. NLRB*, 319 U.S. 533, 544 (1943); *Performance Friction Corp.*, 335 NLRB 1117 (2001); *Atlantic Limousine*, 328 NLRB 257, 258 (1999); *Hacienda Hotel & Casino*, 279 NLRB 601, 603 (1986).

Once the General Counsel has arrived at such amounts, the burden shifts to the respondent to establish affirmative defenses that would mitigate its backpay liability. *Atlantic Limousine*, supra at 258; *Hacienda Hotel & Casino*, supra at 603. Any uncertainties in the amount of backpay due should be resolved in favor of the backpay claimant rather than the respondent, who is responsible for the underlying unfair labor practices that have led to the uncertainties. *United Aircraft Corp.*, 204 NLRB 1068 (1973); *Alaska Pulp Corp.*, supra at 522. Indeed, to hold otherwise would effectively punish backpay claimants for the respondent's illegal conduct against them.

Thus, the general overriding issue here is whether calculations contained in the General Counsel's final backpay specification should be deemed reasonable and therefore accepted, objections from the Respondent and the Union to certain por-

tions thereof notwithstanding. Analyzed in such context, this case is far less complex than the multitude of documents, the 6 days of hearing, the recriminations leveled back and forth throughout the course of proceedings, and the parties' briefs would suggest.

Before turning to specific areas where the Respondent or the Union disagree with the General Counsel's computations, I will address the Respondent's contention that the Region's alleged dilatory compliance investigation, its giving priority to other beer distributors that were also the subject of the order, and its otherwise poor handling of the compliance investigation, should result in a tolling of interest as of June 1, 1999, for employees to whom it owes compensation.

Although the Supreme Court has never clearly held that estoppel is unavailable against the Government, it has repeatedly shown a strong reluctance to find the Government estopped on the same terms as private litigators. *All Shores Radio Co.*, 286 NLRB 394, 398 (1987). For example, in *Schweiker v. Hansen*, 450 U.S. 785 (1981), the Court held that estoppel did not lie in a case where an employee of the Social Security Administration had given erroneous information, resulting in a claimant's failure to comply with a filing requirement.

Specifically in Board proceedings, it is settled law that delay in compliance matters by the Agency will not toll the accumulation of backpay owed to discriminatees, under the principle that they should not be penalized by the acts or omissions of the Government. *NLRB v. J.H. Rutter-Rex Mfg. Co.*, 396 U.S. 258 (1969); *Harding Glass Co.*, 337 NLRB 1116 (2002); *Unitog Rental Services*, 318 NLRB 880 (1995); *Carrothers Construction Co.*, 274 NLRB 762 (1985). As stated by the Supreme Court in *Rutter-Rex Mfg.*, above at 264-265, "Wronged employees are at least as much injured by the Board's delay in collecting their back pay as is the wrong doing employer . . . and the Board is not required to place the consequences of its own delay, even if inordinate, upon wronged employees to the benefit of wrongdoing employers."

Consistent with this principle, the Board has specifically rejected arguments that the doctrine of laches should be applied to penalize discriminatees for the conduct of Regional Offices in compliance matters. *Aroostock County Regional Ophthalmology Center*, 332 NLRB 1616 (2001); *Carrothers Construction Co.*, *Smyth Mfg. Co.*, 277 NLRB 680 (1985). As the Board stated in *Aroostock County Regional Ophthalmology Center*, above at p. 6, "The equitable defense of laches is generally not available in circumstances, like those presently before us, where public policy requires the vindication of the rights of the employees who have been the targets of an employer's unfair labor practices."

The fact that the delay may be substantial does not dictate a contrary result. For example, in *Aroostock Ophthalmology Center*, supra, and *Yorkaire, Inc.*, 328 NLRB 286 (1999), the Board rejected the respondent's argument that the amended compliance specification should be dismissed because of the delay in excess of 2 years between the date when the original

⁵ All full-time and regular part-time driver-salesmen, helpers, warehouse employees, forklift drivers, hand loaders, reclamation employees and breaker pile employees employed by the Respondent at its Pontiac, Michigan facility; but excluding all other employees, professional employees, office clerical employees, guards, and supervisors as defined in the Act.

compliance specification issued and the date that the amended compliance specification.

Accordingly, even assuming *arguendo* that here the Region was solely responsible for the delay in issuing the original specification, that it was dilatory, and that it should have given more priority to this matter *vis-à-vis* other distributors which were found to have committed similar unfair labor practices, the Respondent should receive no benefit at the expense of the employees who suffered because of its illegal conduct.

Therefore, I find no merit whatsoever to the Respondent's arguments that backpay should be tolled because of the Region's delay in issuing the backpay specifications or other alleged deficiencies in investigation. I need not address, therefore, recriminations the Respondent made against the General Counsel and the Union, or counter-accusations leveled by the General Counsel and the Union against the Respondent, in terms of conduct during the compliance investigation and who was to blame for the lengthy process and the failure of the General Counsel to have in its possession full and complete records in a timely fashion.⁶

On the subject of delay, I feel compelled to state that, while I fully appreciate concerns that the backpay specification be as correct as possible, it is regrettable that the discriminatees, some of whom there is no dispute are owed tens of thousands of dollars, will have to wait to be made whole for well over a decade since they first suffered from the Respondent's unfair labor practices.

Issues

1. Whether the General Counsel erred in not accepting the Respondent's assertion that it is entitled to a "productivity credit," based on additional commissions it paid to presell drivers that would not have been paid under the DDOM contract.

2. Whether the General Counsel erred in not accepting the Respondent's assertion that three employees classified as bulk drivers should be treated as freight drivers and therefore not entitled to any commissions.

3. Whether, as asserted by the Respondent, the General Counsel improperly computed holiday pay by calculating floating holiday pay at double-time rate rather than straight-time rate.

4. Whether, as contended by the Union, the General Counsel relied on insufficient documentation provided by the Respondent in computing medical reimbursement costs owed to certain discriminatees.

5. Whether, as contended by the Union, the General Counsel improperly gave the Respondent an offset for the voluntary payment it made to warehouse employees in November 2000.

6. Whether, as contended by the Respondent, the General Counsel improperly apportioned the voluntary payment between principal and interest, as opposed to treating it all as principal.

7. Whether, as contended by the Union, the General Counsel improperly gave the Respondent an offset for workers' compensation payments made to three employees. The Union sec-

ondarily argues that the General Counsel erroneously computed the offset amounts.

Facts

Based on the entire record, including the order, as affirmed by the Sixth Circuit Court of Appeals; testimony of witnesses and my observations of their demeanor; documents; and stipulations of the parties, I make the following findings of fact.

Prior to April 15, 1991, the Respondent employed employees in the following classifications contained in the expired DDOM agreement: drivers (driver-sold and presell), helpers (driver-sold and presell), forklift operators, and reclamation employees. It did not employ hand loaders, freight drivers, or local semi-drivers. Driver-sold drivers obtained sales on their routes and then delivered the product, whereas presell drivers delivered product that was actually sold the previous day. The Respondent had no bulk driver classification prior to April 15, 1991, but subsequently instituted such classification at the time of the implementation.

Prior to April 15, 1991, presell and driver-sold drivers received a base pay of \$8.33 an hour, plus commission, and driver-sold helpers received \$8.23 an hour, plus commission, with commissions based on the number of cases (bottles or cans) delivered.⁷ Presell drivers received \$.30 per case, driver-sold helpers \$.155 per case, and presell driver helpers \$.075 per case. Drivers, but not helpers, also received a commission for picking up empty cases. On April 15, 1991, the Respondent eliminated the base pay rates and instead placed employees in all these classifications wholly on commission.

Methodology Used by the General Counsel

Baines testified in detail regarding his preparation of the compliance specification, based on records and information he received from the Respondent and the Union. He reviewed thousands of pages of payroll records covering 7-plus years. He testified that because the Respondent furnished inadequate information to determine if a helper was assigned to a presell driver or driver-sold driver, the Region had to make certain assumptions. Initially, based on the average earnings of 14 drivers employed during the entire backpay period, he determined that the helpers had engaged more in presell than driver-sold activity and therefore estimated their commission as \$.10 per case, weighted more heavily toward the higher presell commission rate. However, based on additional information provided by the Respondent shortly before the hearing, reflecting there were no driver-sold helpers, the General Counsel amended the specification to provide that helpers (for presell drivers) should receive a commission rate of \$.0075 per case.

I. PRODUCTIVITY CREDIT

The expired contract provided that presell drivers earned a base rate of \$8.33 and a commission of \$.30 for each case they delivered, regardless of whether they had a helper. The contract also contained load limits on the maximum amount of cases a presell driver could deliver in a week. These load limits were strictly enforced, and neither the Respondent nor the employee could benefit from exceeding them.

⁶ I note that over 300 employees in different classifications were involved and that the backpay period was for over 7 years.

⁷ Jt. Exh. 1, article V.

The Respondent changed the compensation to commission only on April 15, 1991, at which time it also eliminated the load limit. Presell drivers were required to deliver as many cases as the Respondent deemed appropriate. The number of cases they delivered went up, and so did their commissions.

The Respondent claims entitlement to an offset against backpay for a productivity credit, based on the additional commissions received by presell drivers vis-à-vis their commissions before April 15, 1991. In this regard, Ferguson testified that the presell drivers were assigned additional helpers after April 15, 1991, and therefore did not work additional hours. However, O'Dwyer, who was a presell driver between 1987 and 1994, and Dennis, who was a presell driver from 1989 until 1994, testified that they worked additional hours after April 15, 1991. Further, O'Dwyer stated there was no difference in the frequency of his being assigned a helper before and after April 15, 1991, while Dennis was uncertain. Both O'Dwyer and Dennis testified that the Respondent assigned them routes over which they had no control, and that after April 15, 1991, they were required to make more stops and deliver more product. The General Counsel seeks backpay equal to \$8.33 per hour worked, arguing that presell drivers had to deliver additional cases in an 8-hour day in order to make up for the elimination of the hourly rate.

Analysis and Conclusions

Even if the presell drivers were not required to work additional hours after April 15, 1991, their working conditions clearly became more onerous. Thus, on a daily basis, they had to make more stops and deliver more product; any additional commissions they received were based solely on their delivering more product to more customers.

In *EDP Medical Computer Systems*, 293 NLRB 857, 858 (1989), the Board, citing *United Aircraft Corp.*, 204 NLRB 1068, 1073 (1973), stated, "[A] backpay claimant who chooses to do the extra work and earn the added income made available on [an] interim job may not be penalized by having the extra earnings deducted from the gross backpay owed by the Respondent." See *Tualatin Electric, Inc.*, 331 NLRB 36, 44 (2000).

Here, the performance of extra work was not voluntary. The presell drivers were required to deliver more cases to more customers in order to earn the same amount of money they had earned before the Respondent unlawfully implemented its new system of compensation. To penalize them now for having had to work harder because of the Respondent's violations of the Act would be to condone the Respondent's commission of unfair labor practices. I categorically reject such an outcome and conclude that the General Counsel did not act unreasonably in determining that the Respondent is not entitled to any offset for its so-called productivity credit.

II. BULK DRIVERS

The expired contract had no bulk driver classification.⁸ At the time of the implementation, the Respondent instituted bulk

driver as a new classification. The three drivers who encumbered this position were compensated at a straight hourly rate of \$12 or \$14 an hour, with no commissions for cases delivered. The General Counsel has concluded that the position of bulk driver was akin to that of presell driver, thereby entitling bulk drivers to the commissions due presell drivers. The Respondent, on the other hand, contends that these bulk drivers were more like freight drivers.

The most reliable witness on the matter of the responsibilities of bulk drivers vis-à-vis presell drivers was Radulski, who was hired as a bulk driver in April 1992 at \$12 an hour with no commissions. He became a presell driver on about June 30, 1998. He testified credibly and without controversion that as a bulk driver and as a presell driver, he did almost everything identically and filled out identical paperwork. Compared to what he did as a bulk driver, the only differences in the performance of his work as a presell driver are that he drives a bigger truck, generally has smaller accounts, and handles the product somewhat differently.

Analysis and Conclusions

Based on Radulski's testimony and the record as a whole, I cannot conclude that the General Counsel acted unreasonably in determining that bulk drivers should be treated as presell drivers in terms of the Respondent's backpay obligations and are entitled to commissions similarly computed. Even accepting the Respondent's argument that the bulk drivers should have been considered freight drivers, the DDOM contract expressly provided that freight drivers receive commissions. I conclude, therefore, that the bulk drivers should receive commissions as computed by the General Counsel.

III. HOLIDAY PAY

Baines testified that the language in the expired DDOM contract providing for holiday pay⁹ was ambiguous, documentation provided by the Respondent was inconsistent and not always complete, and the practice in effect was not in sync with the contractual language. Thus, while the contract provided a special hourly rate for driver-sold drivers of \$14.80 and driver-sold helpers of \$14.70, all drivers and helpers apparently received the same rate. There was also language providing that certain seniority employees hired before May 1, 1987, were to receive a bonus of double pay for certain holidays. However, Baines testified, he had difficulty determining who was eligible, and there was no agreement on this between the Respondent and the Union. Indeed, he testified, the Respondent and the Union could not agree on the amounts of holiday pay other employees should receive.

At the hearing, the General Counsel modified the backpay due for holiday pay for certain employees, because information provided by the Respondent indicated they were not eligible for double pay. The Union agreed that certain employees were credited with too much holiday pay but contended that certain other employees were not credited with enough. However, Baines testified that he increased holiday pay for those employ-

⁸ It did provide for freight drivers, who were to be paid an hourly rate plus "appropriate commissions for full and empties, whichever is

greater." Ibid. As earlier noted, prior to unlawful implementation, the Respondent had no employees classified as regular freight drivers.

⁹ Jt. Exh. 1, art. XII.

ees whom the Union contended were under-credited. He stated he modified his calculations both because of the uncertainty of the practice of the parties and because he had to convert the Respondent's yearly record system to the Board's quarterly backpay system.

The sole issue now raised by the Respondent is whether the General Counsel erred by calculating floating holidays at double-time rate rather than straight-time rate.¹⁰ The Union does not contest the General Counsel's calculation of holiday pay.¹¹

Analysis and Conclusions

As noted earlier, backpay calculations are often not susceptible to precision, and the General Counsel is required only to calculate a reasonable backpay specification, appropriately resolving uncertainties in favor of the backpay claimant. Moreover, it was appropriate for the General Counsel, in attempting to reconstruct as accurately as possible the holiday pay owed to the discriminatees, to consider past practice and the information and arguments presented by the parties.

I conclude that, objections from the Respondent notwithstanding, the General Counsel did not act unreasonably or improperly in computing holiday pay figures, including floating holidays, and that such figures should therefore be accepted.

IV. MEDICAL REIMBURSEMENT

Baines testified that the documentation provided by the Respondent was inadequate to make an accurate computation and that there was no agreement between the Respondent and the Union on this issue. At the hearing, the Respondent conceded that it owed more money than was sought in the original compliance specification. The Union, however, disputed both the General Counsel's and the Respondent's calculations.

At the hearing, Baines amended the specification by using the Respondent's figures when they were beneficial to the employee but keeping the original figures for other employees. The Respondent does not presently contest the Region's computation of what it owes in reimbursement of medical costs.¹² With two exceptions, the Union concedes that the recalculated amounts are supported by the Respondent's records (R. Exh. 27).¹³ The Union contends that the Respondent furnished inadequate documentation regarding employees Brian Dryps, Greg Ratliff, and John Thomson Jr., and failed to provide proof that 27 employees exercised their right to opt out of medical coverage.¹⁴

Analysis and Conclusions

The Union provided no evidence, either testimonial or documentary, to rebut the calculations made by the General Counsel. Ideally, specific documentation pertaining to the employees referenced by the Union would have been provided. However, the General Counsel attempted in dealing with the element of medical reimbursement to arrive at reasonable figures and was satisfied with what the Respondent did provide.

In this regard, Baines used the Respondent's figures when they benefited employees but kept the original figures for other employees.

I cannot conclude in these circumstances that the General Counsel acted unreasonably or arbitrarily in attempting to determine, as best as possible, the medical costs reimbursement owed to discriminatees. Therefore, I accept the General Counsel's computations in this area.

V. VOLUNTARY PAYMENT AND ITS APPORTIONMENT

The General Counsel has agreed with the Respondent that its voluntary payments made to certain warehouse employees in November 2000, totaling \$423,922.28, should be an offset to backpay owed.

The General Counsel divided the payment into principal and interest that would have been due at the time the payment was made. Thus, Baines testified that he applied the voluntary payment using the month that it was paid as if the Board had administered the payment process. Since interest is due and owing on backpay owed by the Respondent, he determined that part of the payment made in November 2000 should be interest. He testified in detail about the methodology he used in computing the division of payment into principal and interest.

The Respondent contends that all of the amount of the voluntary payment should be applied as principal, none as interest. The Respondent bases this largely on its premise that interest should be tolled as of June 1, 1999, an argument I have rejected.

The Union contends that the payments were made without approval of the Region and in noncompliance with Board guidelines (Secs. 10635.1 and 10635.2 of the Case Handling Manual for Compliance Proceedings). Therefore, the Union argues, they should be properly considered nondeductible as a form of gift.¹⁵ The Union also objects to the allocation between interest and principal used by the General Counsel.

Analysis and Conclusions

I reject the Union's argument that the payments should be treated as a gift and not as deductible interim earnings. The paramount principle in compliance proceedings is to make employees "whole" for the unfair labor practices committed against them, not provide them with additional financial enrichment beyond that. Not giving the Respondent credit for the payments it made would result in a "windfall" to employees neither contemplated nor authorized by the Act.

As the General Counsel points out in its brief (at p. 17), even accepting the Respondent's position regarding tolling, there was still considerable interest owing on backpay from April 15, 1991. In any event, I have concluded that interest on backpay should not be tolled as of June 1, 1999, and that the Respondent's backpay obligation continued thereafter. The General Counsel's apportion of principal and interest from April 15, 1991 until November 2000, when the voluntary payment was made, is eminently reasonable, and I accept it, over objections from the Respondent and the Union that it was improperly computed.

¹⁰ R. Br. at 5-6.

¹¹ U. Br. at 38.

¹² R. Br. at 4.

¹³ U. Br. at 39.

¹⁴ Id. at 39-40.

¹⁵ U. Br. at 34.

VI. WORKERS' COMPENSATION PAYMENTS

The Respondent furnished evidence that three employees¹⁶ received workers' compensation payments during the backpay period for job-related injuries, and the General Counsel agreed to give the Respondent credit for these payments. Although the Union objected, it did not present any contrary evidence. It contends, however, that the General Counsel did not correctly calculate the workers' compensation offsets, citing *American Mfg. Co.*, 167 NLRB 520 (1967).¹⁷

Analysis and Conclusions

American Mfg. Co. does not set out a specific formula for offsetting workers compensation payments. Although the Union's interpretation of how the offset should be calculated may well be a permissible one, the General Counsel is free to adopt a contrary interpretation that is not unreasonable or arbitrary; in other words, its computations need only be supportable. I cannot conclude that the General Counsel's formulation of the workers' compensation offsets was impermissible and, accordingly, I accept it.

¹⁶ Michael Lozano, David Nelson, and Dan Newman. See R. Exh. 36.

¹⁷ U. Br. at 29–33.

Conclusion

For the reasons I have stated, I accept the final backpay specification in all respects. For the sake of the over 300 discriminatees, the bargaining unit as a whole, and the existing collective-bargaining relationship between the Respondent and the Union, I offer my hopes that compliance can be concluded as soon as possible.

On the above findings of fact and conclusions of law and on the entire record, I issue the following recommended¹⁸

ORDER

IT IS HEREBY ORDERED that Respondent Hubert Distributors, Inc., Pontiac, Michigan, its officers, agents, successors, and assigns, shall pay the individuals named in the Appendix the indicated amounts of total gross backpay and other reimbursable sums for the period from April 15, 1991 to June 30, 1998,¹⁹ with interest as prescribed in *New Horizons for the Retarded*, 283 NLRB 1173 (1987), accrued to the date of payment and minus tax withholding required by law.

Dated, Washington, D.C. December 16, 2003

¹⁸ If no exceptions are filed as provided by Sec. 102.46 of the Board's Rules and Regulations, the findings, conclusions, and recommended Order shall, as provided in Sec. 102.48 of the Rules, be adopted by the Board and all objections to them shall be deemed waived for all purposes.

¹⁹ I adopt and incorporate by reference the amounts set forth in GC Exh. 20, attached as the Appendix.

APPENDIX

Hubert Distributors, Inc.							
	Name	Last 4 digits of SSN	Total Net Backpay	Total Net Vacation Pay	Total Net Holiday Pay	Total Net Medical	Grand Total
1	Abela, Michael	6499	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 0.00
2	Abram, Clifford	3365	\$ 944.26	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 944.26
3	Agboka, Eric	7624	\$ 628.30	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 628.30
4	Akins, Roderick	8226	\$ 182.33	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 182.33
5	Aldrich, Richard	0249	\$ 111,431.94	\$ 19,779.71	\$ 4,996.13	\$ 2,024.38	\$ 138,232.16
6	Ali, Norris	1086	\$ 2,016.92	\$ 175.73	\$ -	\$ 236.02	\$ 2,428.67
7	Allen, Christopher	3916	\$ 13,667.41	\$ 932.99	\$ 2,374.53	\$ 998.39	\$ 17,973.32
8	Allen, James	6285	\$ 125.38	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 125.38
9	Alpeters, Frank	3667	\$ 6,662.05	\$ 302.91	\$ 823.20	\$ 568.97	\$ 8,357.13
10	Alsup, Christopher	7960	\$ 62.97	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 62.97
11	Anderson, Thomas	4167	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 0.00
12	Andrzejewski, Gerald	4756	\$ 634.36	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 634.36
13	Apker, Timothy	6892	\$ 606.81	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 606.81
14	Arthur, Steven	5302	\$ 253.65	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 253.65
15	Baarck, Brian	7392	\$ 116,033.80	\$ 11,650.62	\$ 8,385.17	\$ 1,910.88	\$ 137,980.47
16	Bade, Mark	0753	\$ 97,077.87	\$ 15,979.75	\$ 7,834.87	\$ 1,799.31	\$ 122,691.80
17	Baird, Jason	4081	\$ 2,735.53	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 2,735.53
18	Barconey, James	4344	\$ 28,250.80	\$ 2,485.08	\$ 2,037.38	\$ 835.31	\$ 33,608.57
19	Bean, Ronald	9821	\$ 863.45	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 14.75	\$ 878.20
20	Beard, Harold	6689	\$ 172.35	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 172.35
21	Benner, Michael	4567	\$ 593.83	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 593.83
22	Bennet, James	5219	\$ 4,108.19	\$ 196.04	\$ 352.80	\$ 230.18	\$ 4,887.21
23	Bergen, Daniel	2367	\$ 1,217.60	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 1,217.60
24	Beyer, John	0884	\$ 63,223.62	\$ 2,270.81	\$ 2,626.58	\$ 1,162.98	\$ 69,283.99
25	Blankenbeckler, Olen	5370	\$ 81,149.75	\$ 15,044.59	\$ 4,943.61	\$ 3,148.65	\$ 104,286.60
26	Bommarito, David	3146	\$ 237.92	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 237.92
27	Bond, Josh	3900	\$ 250.35	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 250.35
28	Bowie, John	0927	\$ 29.90	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 29.90
29	Boyett, Bobby	0557	\$ 521.61	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 521.61
30	Bradfield, Mark	0178	\$ 1,151.79	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 1,151.79
31	Braun, Leslie	0716	\$ 24,641.85	\$ 5,691.87	\$ 4,079.56	\$ 2,544.07	\$ 36,957.35
32	Britton, Monty	4027	\$ 1,390.62	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 1,390.62
33	Brukwinski, Daniel	1792	\$ 63,378.68	\$ 9,540.76	\$ 5,336.75	\$ 2,253.62	\$ 80,509.81
34	Bryan, William	1364	\$ 116,280.50	\$ 18,327.62	\$ 5,389.73	\$ -	\$ 139,997.85
35	Bubnes, Charles	7303	\$ 5,198.02	\$ 352.57	\$ 1,765.35	\$ -	\$ 7,315.94
36	Burek, Michael	6671	\$ 748.39	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 748.39
37	Burl, Gerald	7041	\$ 1.40	\$ 2,871.87	\$ 6,051.21	\$ 2,015.07	\$ 10,939.55
38	Burrows, Robert	3142	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 0.00
39	Burrows, Timothy	5526	\$ 44,554.42	\$ 1,196.62	\$ 2,133.30	\$ 1,371.64	\$ 49,255.98
40	Butki, Nathan	4594	\$ 42.78	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 42.78
41	Cadotte, James	1243	\$ 4,708.18	\$ 659.53	\$ 424.89	\$ -	\$ 5,792.60
42	Campbell, Mark	0956	\$ 18,443.23	\$ 1,385.78	\$ 1,118.98	\$ -	\$ 20,947.99
43	Carle, Jared	6671	\$ 900.64	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 900.64
44	Carrington, James	2191	\$ 19.58	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 19.58
45	Carter, William	9838	\$ 143.07	\$ 64.00	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 207.07

Hubert Distributors, Inc.							
	Name	Last 4 digits of SSN	Total Net Backpay	Total Net Vacation Pay	Total Net Holiday Pay	Total Net Medical	Grand Total
46	Cashin, William	1285	\$ 1,647.22	\$ 136.78	\$ -	\$ 8.98	\$ 1,792.98
47	Chatmon II, Leotis	4327	\$ 1,378.39	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 1,378.39
48	Chaustowich, Mark	4741	\$ 72,523.23	\$ 5,354.38	\$ 5,189.69	\$ 2,153.77	\$ 85,221.07
49	Chavez, Santiago	0316	\$ 488.04	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 488.04
50	Childress, Richard	7471	\$ 106,894.54	\$ 16,985.77	\$ 8,147.74	\$ 3,510.24	\$ 135,538.29
51	Cianek, Shane	4144	\$ 20,410.45	\$ 1,212.71	\$ 2,488.35	\$ -	\$ 24,111.51
52	Clark, Anthony	4199	\$ 350.58	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 350.58
53	Coffey, Gary	0131	\$ 549.44	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 549.44
54	Cole, Eric	5608	\$ 8,549.89	\$ 648.25	\$ 1,105.20	\$ 840.34	\$ 11,143.68
55	Collias, Nick	9379	\$ 6,997.51	\$ 303.57	\$ 823.20	\$ 350.23	\$ 8,474.51
56	Contreras, Ysabel	5885	\$ 2,984.66	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 2,984.66
57	Cook, Gary	9161	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 0.00
58	Cook, Peter	4017	\$ 30,393.58	\$ 3,629.92	\$ 2,245.27	\$ 1,117.45	\$ 37,386.22
59	Cooper, Stephen	0865	\$ 647.43	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 647.43
60	Cox, Paul	9673	\$ 1,102.01	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 1,102.01
61	Cox, Robert	1931	\$ 38.35	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 38.35
62	Crandall, Tracy	6823	\$ 6,139.93	\$ 2,311.32	\$ 5,029.75	\$ 796.20	\$ 14,277.20
63	Crosky, Kevin	0840	\$ 0.09	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 0.09
64	Cummins, Steve	0585	\$ 11.98	\$ 5,817.55	\$ 10,244.71	\$ 3,835.42	\$ 19,909.66
65	Davis, Chad	1793	\$ 12,757.61	\$ 824.82	\$ 1,955.52	\$ 44.00	\$ 15,581.95
66	Davis, Eugene	0570	\$ 250.75	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 250.75
67	Day, Gilbert	4777	\$ 10,267.40	\$ 651.14	\$ 570.31	\$ 273.54	\$ 11,762.39
68	Deel, Denis	5909	\$ 5,725.09	\$ 261.11	\$ 470.40	\$ 225.63	\$ 6,682.23
69	Demers, Mark	0456	\$ 0.23	\$ 6,575.19	\$ 10,144.40	\$ 2,388.87	\$ 19,108.69
70	Denham, Derek	1547	\$ 1,334.11	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 1,334.11
71	Denis, David	6159	\$ 92,845.06	\$ 15,469.27	\$ 8,108.08	\$ -	\$ 116,422.41
72	Dionne, Thomas	9229	\$ 60.45	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 60.45
73	Dixson, Bryant	6373	\$ 53.84	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 53.84
74	Dixson, Kevin	6471	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 0.00
75	Dorey, Gregory	6987	\$ 18,341.93	\$ 4,221.98	\$ 1,845.26	\$ 796.20	\$ 25,205.37
76	Dosch, Howard	5869	\$ 6,931.98	\$ 297.05	\$ 614.00	\$ 447.56	\$ 8,290.59
77	Dowdy, Glen	8871	\$ 42,830.12	\$ 1,803.10	\$ 2,242.96	\$ 2,128.28	\$ 49,004.46
78	Doyle, Peter	9491	\$ 831.43	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 831.43
79	Draper, Jon	3010	\$ 66,008.71	\$ 6,090.58	\$ 2,493.92	\$ 3,838.99	\$ 78,432.20
80	Dryps, Brian	8602	\$ 43,031.27	\$ 3,975.82	\$ 4,214.15	\$ -	\$ 51,221.24
81	Duncan, Carter	1568	\$ 9,615.35	\$ 474.43	\$ 1,476.24	\$ 903.57	\$ 12,469.59
82	Dunne, Timothy	3906	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 0.00
83	Dymon, Jeffrey	8579	\$ 1,609.32	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 1,609.32
84	Eady Jr., Jeremiah	2701	\$ 29,235.50	\$ 4,595.70	\$ 5,367.89	\$ 22.00	\$ 39,221.09
85	Eager, David	9499	\$ 663.67	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 663.67
86	Emming, Rodney	1847	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 0.00
87	Englund, Robert	4738	\$ 460.20	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 460.20
88	Enoex, Eric	4532	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 0.00
89	Eslick, William	0310	\$ 15.88	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 15.88
90	Ewell, Beverly	8987	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 0.00
91	Fagerlie, Brent	0018	\$ 50.07	\$ 1,645.22	\$ 2,738.10	\$ -	\$ 4,433.39
92	Fedorowych, Alex	0078	\$ 7,159.00	\$ 326.99	\$ 352.80	\$ 409.17	\$ 8,247.96

Hubert Distributors, Inc.							
	Name	Last 4 digits of SSN	Total Net Backpay	Total Net Vacation Pay	Total Net Holiday Pay	Total Net Medical	Grand Total
93	Fern, Gerald	6837	\$ 15,284.09	\$ 875.95	\$ 1,021.10	\$ -	\$ 17,181.14
94	Fields, Bruce	6178	\$ 76,439.28	\$ 12,798.23	\$ 5,751.54	\$ 2,042.88	\$ 97,031.93
95	Finley, Omar	3405	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 0.00
96	Fisher, James	8858	\$ 287.62	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 287.62
97	Flentroy, Tony	4030	\$ 562.09	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 562.09
98	Foster, Eric	8794	\$ 244.33	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 244.33
99	Fox, Bruce	0452	\$ 33.33	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 33.33
100	Frye, James	6193	\$ 13,689.75	\$ 1,874.86	\$ 1,849.44	\$ 85.61	\$ 17,499.66
101	Fuhr, Jason	7738	\$ 2,575.69	\$ 236.10	\$ -	\$ 54.53	\$ 2,866.32
102	Gagel, Robert	4952	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 0.00
103	Galley, Brian	5466	\$ 618.39	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 618.39
104	Garza, Ramon	8102	\$ 381.76	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 381.76
105	Gates, Donald	2597	\$ 94,340.30	\$ 12,273.97	\$ 7,637.08	\$ 408.72	\$ 114,660.07
106	Gibson, Brad	2603	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 0.00
107	Girard, Aaron	5463	\$ 2,757.68	\$ -	\$ 491.20	\$ 22.00	\$ 3,270.88
108	Gizoni, Joseph	8754	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 0.00
109	Glynn, Gregory	3242	\$ 117,823.77	\$ 17,781.68	\$ 8,497.09	\$ 4,014.20	\$ 148,116.74
110	Golden, Christopher	2574	\$ 3,545.44	\$ 199.16	\$ 588.00	\$ 191.81	\$ 4,524.41
111	Gonzales, Ricardo	1900	\$ 1,515.56	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 1,515.56
112	Grabowski, Jon	1113	\$ 7,065.49	\$ 280.01	\$ 368.40	\$ 159.55	\$ 7,873.45
113	Grala, Jeff	0388	\$ 17,732.69	\$ 1,036.91	\$ 2,019.95	\$ -	\$ 20,789.55
114	Granberry, Deimon	5470	\$ 35.40	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 35.40
115	Grant, Steven	1354	\$ 890.89	\$ -	\$ 354.40	\$ 652.00	\$ 1,897.29
116	Grant, Wallace	4933	\$ 12,720.16	\$ 956.02	\$ 2,234.40	\$ 1,400.19	\$ 17,310.77
117	Grates, Todd	5960	\$ 1,148.80	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 63.94	\$ 1,212.74
118	Grech III, George	7668	\$ 896.59	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 896.59
119	Green, Darrell	0781	\$ 292.73	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 292.73
120	Green, Mark	9925	\$ 477.78	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 477.78
121	Green, Robert	6270	\$ 8,311.58	\$ 426.17	\$ 1,058.40	\$ 338.16	\$ 10,134.31
122	Greggs, Markette	8147	\$ 162.25	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 162.25
123	Griffen, Patricia	2613	\$ 401.20	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 401.20
124	Griffore, Thomas	5960	\$ 749.78	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 749.78
125	Grundy, Leon	5693	\$ 434.26	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 434.26
126	Haddad Jr., Gerald	8705	\$ 18,754.03	\$ 993.56	\$ 3,998.40	\$ 567.00	\$ 24,312.99
127	Hall, Patricia	6841	\$ 205.47	\$ 1,030.86	\$ 533.71	\$ -	\$ 1,770.04
128	Harden, Stephen	6880	\$ 11,672.17	\$ 512.68	\$ 2,587.20	\$ 85.00	\$ 14,857.05
129	Hart, David	8016	\$ 33.71	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 33.71
130	Hawley, Chad	1001	\$ 5,508.20	\$ 227.06	\$ 235.20	\$ 281.15	\$ 6,251.61
131	Heabeart, Thomas	7115	\$ 71,773.55	\$ 9,045.77	\$ 1,226.60	\$ 3,930.94	\$ 85,976.86
132	Heath, Sonny	8199	\$ 6,198.33	\$ 456.36	\$ 705.60	\$ 575.44	\$ 7,935.73
133	Helton, Steven	0587	\$ 1,506.11	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 1,506.11
134	Hillaker, Todd	2616	\$ 161.66	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 161.66
135	Hillie, Lance	2517	\$ 650.60	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 650.60
136	Hockstad, Terry	9091	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 0.00
137	Hoh, Todd	7071	\$ 4,278.41	\$ 197.79	\$ 117.60	\$ 235.40	\$ 4,829.20
138	Holmes, Larry	1275	\$ 40.42	\$ 661.09	\$ 554.80	\$ -	\$ 1,256.31

Hubert Distributors, Inc.							
	Name	Last 4 digits of SSN	Total Net Backpay	Total Net Vacation Pay	Total Net Holiday Pay	Total Net Medical	Grand Total
139	Holtzberg, Troy	2110	\$ 9,387.72	\$ 463.93	\$ 1,176.00	\$ 600.54	\$ 11,628.19
140	Hopkins, Andre	4671	\$ 11,344.73	\$ 736.89	\$ 1,528.80	\$ 774.64	\$ 14,385.06
141	Hopper, Trevor	3255	\$ 19.99	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 19.99
142	Hubbard, Thomas	6864	\$ 5,449.03	\$ 248.19	\$ 256.54	\$ -	\$ 5,953.76
143	Hunter, John	8249	\$ 20,640.24	\$ 592.67	\$ 2,004.00	\$ 1,540.31	\$ 24,777.22
144	Isola, Christopher	4367	\$ 47,157.29	\$ 1,871.63	\$ 1,989.85	\$ -	\$ 51,018.77
145	Jackson, Brian	1622	\$ 6,934.86	\$ 1,936.74	\$ 588.39	\$ -	\$ 9,459.99
146	Jackson, Tracy	1318	\$ 1,012.08	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 133.75	\$ 1,145.83
147	Jacob, Jeff	6425	\$ 30.98	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 30.98
148	James, Christopher	1132	\$ 349.29	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 349.29
149	Jasmine, Keith	1861	\$ 5,971.57	\$ 420.37	\$ 705.60	\$ 493.14	\$ 7,590.68
150	Jefferson, Hosie	9866	\$ 401.41	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 401.41
151	Jensen, Kristofer	3328	\$ 5,457.39	\$ 921.56	\$ 1,537.60	\$ 1,274.39	\$ 9,190.94
152	Johnson, Darrance	3016	\$ 83.34	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 83.34
153	Johnson, Ronald	3019	\$ 301.76	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 301.76
154	Jordan, Gary	4866	\$ 49,316.49	\$ 9,653.55	\$ 5,350.83	\$ 3,169.44	\$ 67,490.31
155	Judon, Michael	6201	\$ 12,474.42	\$ 530.24	\$ 655.20	\$ -	\$ 13,659.86
156	Jurkiw, Dennis	7397	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 0.00
157	Kadar, Michael	3893	\$ 1,019.29	\$ -	\$ 39.00	\$ -	\$ 1,058.29
158	Kasprzynski, William	9274	\$ 16,132.23	\$ 854.87	\$ 2,352.00	\$ 1,262.90	\$ 20,602.00
159	Katzman, Jeffrey	1821	\$ 14,349.45	\$ 1,359.62	\$ 2,704.80	\$ 1,403.85	\$ 19,817.72
160	Kelly, Eric	5362	\$ 2,208.97	\$ -	\$ 117.60	\$ 62.26	\$ 2,388.83
161	Kendrick, Clarke	6488	\$ 1,977.93	\$ 192.60	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 2,170.53
162	Kennedy, Darryl	6583	\$ 77,623.41	\$ 4,809.32	\$ 3,669.60	\$ 1,941.70	\$ 88,044.03
163	Kennedy, Jonathan	6302	\$ 477.01	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 477.01
164	Klee, Kirk	8263	\$ 10,023.47	\$ 418.96	\$ 859.60	\$ 350.23	\$ 11,652.26
165	Klingensmith, James	6843	\$ 4,141.90	\$ -	\$ 699.60	\$ 82.50	\$ 4,924.00
166	Kokoszka, Christopher	1694	\$ 1,605.65	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 1,605.65
167	Kokoszka, Donald	2670	\$ 50,884.38	\$ 9,182.46	\$ 3,139.36	\$ 796.20	\$ 64,002.40
168	Kolich, Keith	2931	\$ 1,336.66	\$ 2,061.39	\$ 3,809.59	\$ 3,384.20	\$ 10,591.84
169	Kott, Christopher	6371	\$ 3,743.22	\$ 197.77	\$ 235.20	\$ 248.83	\$ 4,425.02
170	Kraus, Kevin	4494	\$ 24,547.44	\$ 5,030.06	\$ 3,463.02	\$ 1,304.93	\$ 34,345.45
171	Kremm, Barry	6938	\$ 77.03	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 77.03
172	Lamer, Dean	4272	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 0.00
173	Lavalais, Michael	1353	\$ 357.69	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 357.69
174	Lee, Henry	6312	\$ 823.03	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 823.03
175	Leib, Lawrence	2472	\$ 52.81	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 52.81
176	Lewis, Robert	1068	\$ 21.29	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 21.29
177	Lewis, Thomas	5752	\$ 11,766.98	\$ 942.29	\$ 93.72	\$ 742.23	\$ 13,545.22
178	Lezell, Lee	7611	\$ 53.55	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 53.55
179	Litteral, Franklin	0414	\$ 19.58	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 19.58
180	Lottie, Thomas	9808	\$ 98,780.10	\$ 6,572.73	\$ 3,196.29	\$ 3,840.66	\$ 112,389.78
181	Lozano, Michael	0494	\$ 107,701.54	\$ 20,199.32	\$ 11,484.34	\$ 3,840.66	\$ 143,225.86
182	Lyons, Darryl	4008	\$ 125,193.35	\$ 13,754.72	\$ 8,819.23	\$ 3,840.66	\$ 151,607.96
183	Mackiewicz, John	1920	\$ 62,197.05	\$ 4,209.54	\$ 4,753.92	\$ -	\$ 71,160.51
184	Maierle, Peter	8104	\$ 27.56	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 27.56

Hubert Distributors, Inc.							
	Name	Last 4 digits of SSN	Total Net Backpay	Total Net Vacation Pay	Total Net Holiday Pay	Total Net Medical	Grand Total
185	Mannion III, William	3177	\$ 547.61	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 547.61
186	Manns, Andre	9949	\$ 88.50	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 88.50
187	Manolatos, Mychal	5776	\$ 66.79	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 66.79
188	Marquette, Clifford	3160	\$ 2,650.37	\$ -	\$ 443.09	\$ -	\$ 3,093.46
189	McAnaul, Matthew	7518	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 0.00
190	McBride, John	9422	\$ 1,023.55	\$ -	\$ 51.02	\$ -	\$ 1,074.57
191	McCaffery, Patrick	6994	\$ 3.59	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 3.58
192	McCain, Billy	2273	\$ 7,684.97	\$ 250.22	\$ 118.40	\$ 185.78	\$ 8,239.37
193	McCan, Michael	9365	\$ 171.44	\$ 114.56	\$ 22.91	\$ -	\$ 308.91
194	McClain, George	0362	\$ 50.75	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 50.75
195	McConnell, Murl	2582	\$ 28,567.92	\$ 5,440.89	\$ 1,661.33	\$ 248.81	\$ 35,918.95
196	McCoy Jr., Buster	8242	\$ 57,355.79	\$ 5,436.14	\$ 5,238.61	\$ 1,625.21	\$ 69,655.75
197	McDonald, Chris	3392	\$ 3,497.45	\$ 208.50	\$ 117.60	\$ 145.97	\$ 3,969.52
198	McDonald, John	8971	\$ 75.05	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 75.05
199	McGee, Richard	3216	\$ 473.45	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 473.45
200	McGregor Jr., Shannon	1244	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 0.00
201	McMillan, Lanitra	6059	\$ 1,095.46	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 1,095.46
202	Meagher, William	7263	\$ 706.35	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 706.35
203	Meister, Robert	4093	\$ 9,739.95	\$ 1,107.24	\$ 1,268.42	\$ -	\$ 12,115.61
204	Michael, David	9523	\$ 1.91	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 1.91
205	Mihalak II, Stephen	2493	\$ 12,834.64	\$ 5,113.42	\$ 5,827.21	\$ 408.72	\$ 24,183.99
206	Miller, Donald	3971	\$ 9,767.17	\$ 397.81	\$ 614.00	\$ 246.33	\$ 11,025.31
207	Miller, Timothy	8886	\$ 1,222.63	\$ 115.53	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 1,338.16
208	Morbach, Thomas	8705	\$ 39,678.26	\$ 2,926.56	\$ 2,337.49	\$ -	\$ 44,942.31
209	Morgan III, Harper	2777	\$ 1,057.98	\$ 196.45	\$ 162.00	\$ -	\$ 1,416.43
210	Moschelli, Matthew	5578	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 0.00
211	Motsinger, Marshall	4406	\$ 28,725.05	\$ 1,347.91	\$ 413.72	\$ 45.93	\$ 30,532.61
212	Munroe, Ryan	1020	\$ 133.50	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 133.50
213	Munson, Alphonso	7381	\$ 129.68	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 129.68
214	Murray, William	8422	\$ 7,311.57	\$ -	\$ 940.80	\$ 873.93	\$ 9,126.30
215	Musgraves, Maurece	6249	\$ 485.44	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 485.44
216	Myers, Kenneth	1603	\$ 114,026.80	\$ 18,381.88	\$ 8,680.02	\$ 3,820.20	\$ 144,908.90
217	Nelson, David	1844	\$ 38,095.78	\$ 4,509.06	\$ 2,377.03	\$ -	\$ 44,981.87
218	Newman, Dan	8857	\$ 36,796.46	\$ 7,968.84	\$ 3,155.06	\$ 2,052.42	\$ 49,972.78
219	Nicholas, Sydney	7949	\$ 1,351.66	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 1,351.66
220	Nizio, Stephen	4544	\$ 22.06	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 22.06
221	O'Dwyer, Thomas	2917	\$ 83,817.08	\$ 14,055.04	\$ 7,376.59	\$ 2,381.66	\$ 107,630.37
222	Orr, David	8371	\$ 1,007.43	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 1,007.43
223	Owens, Jodi	6132	\$ 46.80	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 46.80
224	Palazzola, James	4158	\$ 4,854.13	\$ 329.20	\$ 371.62	\$ -	\$ 5,554.95
225	Pangborn, Larry	5504	\$ 254.65	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 254.65
226	Paquette, Daniel	8486	\$ 88.44	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 88.44
227	Parise, Mark	0989	\$ 29,547.96	\$ 1,774.42	\$ 1,306.84	\$ 683.14	\$ 33,312.36
228	Parker, Brian	0046	\$ 4.13	\$ 1,336.09	\$ 780.61	\$ -	\$ 2,120.83
229	Pate, Michael	3784	\$ 1,656.97	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 1,656.97
230	Patton, Thomas	6848	\$ 4,900.52	\$ 272.40	\$ 823.20	\$ 403.50	\$ 6,399.62

Hubert Distributors, Inc.							
	Name	Last 4 digits of SSN	Total Net Backpay	Total Net Vacation Pay	Total Net Holiday Pay	Total Net Medical	Grand Total
231	Pelkey, Bryan	5435	\$ 259.16	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 259.16
232	Pershing, Sean	0024	\$ 828.95	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 828.95
233	Pitcher, Gerald	2804	\$ 59.55	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 59.55
234	Pongrac, Joseph	9568	\$ 396.15	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 396.15
235	Powell, Anthony	2182	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 0.00
236	Powers, Jeffrey	6080	\$ 21,900.86	\$ 4,724.03	\$ 5,297.19	\$ 932.41	\$ 32,854.49
237	Price, Scott	4928	\$ 11.78	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 11.78
238	Price, Troy	8036	\$ 1,444.95	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 16.94	\$ 1,461.89
239	Pryor Jr., Anthony	9273	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 0.00
240	Pugh, Dwight	5044	\$ 104,605.33	\$ 14,848.69	\$ 7,390.07	\$ 3,840.66	\$ 130,684.75
241	Pyszel, Jeffrey	6189	\$ 20,795.70	\$ 955.23	\$ 4,051.65	\$ 807.00	\$ 26,609.58
242	Radulski, James	9401	\$ 161,630.44	\$ 5,115.71	\$ 3,662.27	\$ 3,840.66	\$ 174,248.54
243	Ramsey, Winburn	6279	\$ 1,959.54	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 1,959.54
244	Ratliff, Greg	9223	\$ 28,514.88	\$ 1,153.15	\$ 2,259.11	\$ 240.00	\$ 32,167.14
245	Redd II, William	0124	\$ 114.00	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 114.00
246	Reid, John	3082	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 0.00
247	Robinson, Tameka	1379	\$ 159.49	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 159.49
248	Rogers, Michael	7988	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 0.00
249	Ross, Kirk	8889	\$ 30.24	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 30.24
250	Ruiz, Orlando	1330	\$ 31,386.58	\$ 892.31	\$ 1,973.84	\$ -	\$ 34,252.73
251	Russell, Robert	8090	\$ 14,144.91	\$ 802.94	\$ 2,760.31	\$ -	\$ 17,708.16
252	Ryden, Jeffrey	3483	\$ 2,870.09	\$ 205.85	\$ 123.51	\$ -	\$ 3,199.45
253	Saje, Steven	0916	\$ 73.75	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 73.75
254	Sanchez, John	1465	\$ 40.85	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 40.85
255	Santi, Gabriel	8276	\$ 86.93	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 86.93
256	Scheib, Brandon	9190	\$ 5,561.75	\$ 276.02	\$ 470.40	\$ 194.08	\$ 6,502.25
257	Schumacher, Michael	5556	\$ 1,862.35	\$ -	\$ 117.60	\$ 9.32	\$ 1,989.27
258	Scott, Devin	5460	\$ 49.75	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 49.75
259	Seaman, James	7734	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 0.00
260	Sellers, Michael	2494	\$ 4,805.19	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 4,805.19
261	Shattuck, Benjamin	2869	\$ 1,761.15	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 1,761.15
262	Sink, Stephen	5005	\$ 315.05	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 315.05
263	Slabinski, Andrew	7133	\$ 31.88	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 31.88
264	Slater, Quentin	2212	\$ 60.94	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 60.94
265	Smith, Anthony	3675	\$ 122.36	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 122.36
266	Smith, Edward	5947	\$ 29.83	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 29.83
267	Smith, Keith	1478	\$ 1,240.48	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 1,240.48
268	Smith, Kenneth	4374	\$ 5,979.61	\$ 268.41	\$ 117.60	\$ 232.23	\$ 6,597.85
269	Smith Jr., Milton	9196	\$ 2,184.91	\$ 83.37	\$ 235.20	\$ -	\$ 2,503.48
270	Snyder, Mark	6111	\$ 44,996.00	\$ 3,213.95	\$ 3,577.60	\$ 523.72	\$ 52,311.27
271	Spann Jr., Howard	8975	\$ 104,619.88	\$ 6,173.14	\$ 4,312.61	\$ 652.00	\$ 115,757.63
272	Spivy, Robert	7229	\$ 6.42	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 6.42
273	Stabile, Ben	5900	\$ 112.38	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 112.38
274	Stark, Dale	5483	\$ 87,943.43	\$ 8,027.39	\$ 10,394.82	\$ 3,820.20	\$ 110,185.84
275	Steverson, John	1118	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 0.00
276	Steward, Joseph	1025	\$ 2,373.28	\$ 210.23	\$ 235.20	\$ 112.93	\$ 2,931.64

Hubert Distributors, Inc.							
	Name	Last 4 digits of SSN	Total Net Backpay	Total Net Vacation Pay	Total Net Holiday Pay	Total Net Medical	Grand Total
277	Stiel, John	9284	\$ 31,727.44	\$ 991.65	\$ 2,400.44	\$ 783.33	\$ 35,902.86
278	Stimage, Mark	6088	\$ 765.34	\$ 26.22	\$ 1,187.49	\$ -	\$ 1,979.05
279	Stogdill, Bruce	6513	\$ 8,621.91	\$ 805.97	\$ 1,379.20	\$ -	\$ 10,807.08
280	Stotts, Aaron	6850	\$ 3,590.04	\$ 172.96	\$ 235.20	\$ 56.46	\$ 4,054.66
281	Strait, Marvin	0318	\$ 3.60	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 3.60
282	Stransky, Trew	2554	\$ 1,349.54	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 1,349.54
283	Street, Patricia	6570	\$ 3,112.25	\$ 2,195.35	\$ 1,387.38	\$ 780.50	\$ 7,475.48
284	Strode, Eric	7061	\$ 130.65	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 130.65
285	Stuart, Steven	9623	\$ 8,513.53	\$ 445.57	\$ 1,176.00	\$ 815.61	\$ 10,950.71
286	Sturza, Dennis	4136	\$ 45,036.04	\$ 7,522.96	\$ 2,280.19	\$ 796.20	\$ 55,635.39
287	Sutter, Stephen	0395	\$ 158.46	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 158.46
288	Sweet, Richard	1528	\$ 633.08	\$ -	\$ 236.80	\$ -	\$ 869.88
289	Szeremet, Anthony	6676	\$ 14,739.12	\$ 1,010.11	\$ 2,829.81	\$ -	\$ 18,579.04
290	Tackett, Jeffrey	2050	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 0.00
291	Taylor, Eric	4447	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 0.00
292	Taylor, Jermaine	4026	\$ 2,659.06	\$ -	\$ 491.20	\$ 176.50	\$ 3,326.76
293	Teneyuque II, Richard	5671	\$ 894.99	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 894.99
294	Tep, Tito	9826	\$ 250.58	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 250.58
295	Thatcher, David	2739	\$ 30,459.21	\$ -	\$ 1,300.80	\$ 652.00	\$ 32,412.01
296	Thomas, Daniel	0877	\$ 18,272.39	\$ 1,467.35	\$ 1,100.03	\$ 868.08	\$ 21,707.85
297	Thomas, Edward	5326	\$ 132.29	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 132.29
298	Thomas, Jason	1577	\$ 228.35	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 228.35
299	Thomason, Charles	9347	\$ 42,735.34	\$ 7,099.35	\$ 4,016.63	\$ 924.08	\$ 54,775.40
300	Thompson Jr., John	0706	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 0.00
301	Thornberry, Todd	6262	\$ 770.52	\$ 126.63	\$ -	\$ 76.56	\$ 973.71
302	Tomayko, Martin	5771	\$ 1,278.06	\$ 195.38	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 1,473.44
303	Townsend, William	3862	\$ 78,206.74	\$ 11,844.97	\$ 5,399.18	\$ -	\$ 95,450.89
304	Trammel, Jason	2772	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 0.00
305	Travis, James	8879	\$ 40,530.85	\$ 3,925.06	\$ 5,624.45	\$ 2,443.50	\$ 52,523.86
306	Tripoli, James	4222	\$ 372.45	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 372.45
307	Trudeau, Terry	8386	\$ 83,974.39	\$ 14,709.74	\$ 10,155.57	\$ 3,840.66	\$ 112,680.36
308	Trumble, Robert	9757	\$ 4,020.55	\$ 193.07	\$ 705.60	\$ 63.94	\$ 4,983.16
309	Tucker, Brad	5197	\$ 5,833.92	\$ 140.83	\$ 352.80	\$ -	\$ 6,327.55
310	Tudor, Jay	6007	\$ 1,436.65	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 1,436.65
311	Tulk, Wade	1410	\$ 500.17	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 500.17
312	Tymes, Marc	0689	\$ 512.85	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 512.85
313	Wagner, Rodney	0314	\$ 16.69	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 16.69
314	Warner, Al	1799	\$ 45,421.57	\$ 2,404.12	\$ 3,193.78	\$ 1,696.08	\$ 52,715.55
315	Warner, David	3815	\$ 576.09	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 576.09
316	Washington, Lavoisie	9834	\$ 1,150.83	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 1,150.83
317	Washington, Michael	1786	\$ 17,916.27	\$ 742.39	\$ 3,439.65	\$ 1,396.58	\$ 23,494.89
318	Watkins, Donald	9783	\$ 7,914.27	\$ -	\$ 702.70	\$ -	\$ 8,616.97
319	Wayne, Thomas	2766	\$ 2,839.87	\$ 195.96	\$ 470.40	\$ 201.75	\$ 3,707.98
320	Weaver Jr., Richard	0810	\$ 39.14	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 39.14
321	Weber II, Daniel	2133	\$ 52.36	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 52.36
322	Wengstrom, Brandy	0460	\$ 20,083.87	\$ 893.35	\$ 3,880.80	\$ 609.00	\$ 25,467.02

Hubert Distributors, Inc.							
	Name	Last 4 digits of SSN	Total Net Backpay	Total Net Vacation Pay	Total Net Holiday Pay	Total Net Medical	Grand Total
323	Wessell, Kenneth	8390	\$ 167.82	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 167.82
324	Weston, Gerald	0709	\$ 78,080.05	\$ 9,482.01	\$ 9,062.25	\$ 3,840.66	\$ 100,464.97
325	Williams, Alvin	8153	\$ 8,889.84	\$ 392.14	\$ 1,176.00	\$ 486.00	\$ 10,943.98
326	Williams, Derrick	8783	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 0.00
327	Williams, Kevin	3802	\$ 793.99	\$ 78.81	\$ 235.20	\$ -	\$ 1,108.00
328	Williams, Nancy	8222	\$ 83.85	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 83.85
329	Williams, Otis	9056	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 0.00
330	Williams, Terrance	5909	\$ 311.26	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 311.26
331	Wilson, Ben	8348	\$ 68,639.14	\$ 2,079.02	\$ 2,522.31	\$ 3,044.46	\$ 76,284.93
332	Wilson, Lonny	7674	\$ 950.69	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 950.69
333	Wimbrow, Dennis	8688	\$ 22,898.10	\$ 6,687.10	\$ 11,918.17	\$ 3,264.42	\$ 44,767.79
334	Wyatt, Franklin	0503	\$ 7,518.21	\$ 362.16	\$ 643.30	\$ 398.10	\$ 8,921.77
335	Yenglin Jr., Leonard	8552	\$ 12,590.72	\$ 1,421.19	\$ 3,688.26	\$ -	\$ 17,700.17
336	Young, David	3260	\$ 21,114.36	\$ 366.89	\$ 1,569.03	\$ 1,409.00	\$ 24,459.28
337	Zale, Joseph	0689	\$ 3,802.10	\$ 184.14	\$ 235.20	\$ 159.55	\$ 4,380.99
338	Zamfir, Bruno	4432	\$ 2,164.43	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 2,164.43
	TOTALS		\$4,664,603.22	\$ 537,941.64	\$ 421,664.14	\$ 148,527.97	\$5,772,736.97